

1 **BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

2 MIKE GLEASON
CHAIRMAN
3 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
COMMISSIONER
4 JEFF HATCH-MILLER
COMMISSIONER
5 KRISTIN K. MAYES
COMMISSIONER
6 GARY PEARCE
COMMISSIONER

7
8 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
9 ARIZONA-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
10 FOR APPROVALS ASSOCIATED WITH A
TRANSACTION WITH THE MARICOPA
COUNTY MUNICIPAL WATER
CONSERVATION DISTRICT NUMBER ONE.

Docket No. W-01303A-05-0718

11 **RUCO'S CLOSING BRIEF**

12 **INTRODUCTION**

13 The Residential Utility Consumer Office ("RUCO") submits this Brief in support of its
14 position that the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") should approve Arizona
15 American Water Company's ("Arizona American" or "Company") Hook-Up Fee proposal
16 outlined in its Revised Application. RUCO prefers the Company's second option¹ of approving
17 a hook-up fee that would start at \$4,700 for a 5/8 by 3/4-inch meter. The second option results
18 in lesser accruals of AFUDC, which would temporarily flow into customers' rates. RUCO has
19 no objection to the issuance of an accounting order as requested. Finally, RUCO does not
20 object to the Company seeking in its 2008 rate case adjustments to the Hook-Up Fees and a
21 mechanism to recover operation and maintenance costs for the White Tanks Plant. However,
22

23 _____
24 ¹ The Company's first option would proposes a hook-up fee that would start at \$1,150 for a 5/8 by 3/4-inch
meter

1 RUCO requests that the Commission indicate in its Decision on this application that it is not
2 predetermining the appropriateness of any such modifications to the Hook-Up Fee or the
3 appropriateness of any mechanism to recover operation and maintenance costs.

4
5 **THE COMMISSION DOES NOT HAVE TO, NOR SHOULD IT CONSIDER THE DISTRICT'S**
6 **REQUEST TO DETERMINE THE PRUDENCY OF THE COMPANY'S DECISION TO BUILD**
7 **THE WHITE TANK PLANT.**

8 When the smoke clears, the Maricopa County Municipal Water Conservation District
9 Number One ("MWD" or "District") is asking the Commission to pre-determine the prudence of
10 the Company's White Tank plant proposal. The District believes that its plant proposal is
11 superior to the Company's proposal in terms of cost, profit motive, integration with other
12 operations and impact on landowners. D-45 at 7². Most of the testimony in this proceeding
13 has involved the consideration of the estimated costs that both the District and the Company
14 would spend in building the White Tank Plant. Other issues that have been examined at
15 length include the different timelines required to build the new plant as well as the underlying
16 motivations of the District and the Company. While all of this is very interesting, the
17 Commission does not have to, nor should it make a decision based on any of it.

18 The Company, not the District, has the Certificate of Convenience and Necessity
19 ("CC&N") to serve the service territory in question. It is the Company which is obligated to
20 provide water service to its customers. It is the Company that is responsible for building the
21 plant necessary to serve its customers. The Company is not asking the Commission to build
22 the plant, it is asking the Commission to approve a method of financing the construction. The

23 ² For ease of reference, trial exhibits will be identified similar to their identification in the Transcript of
24 Proceedings. The transcript volume number will identify references to the transcript.

1 Company's proposed method of financing the construction is the narrow issue that the
2 Commission is being asked to determine and it should limit its decision to that narrow issue.

3 The District is requesting the Commission reject the Company's proposed method of
4 financing and in the Commission's analysis address a far bigger issue – who should build the
5 plant. While the District claims it is the Company that is requesting “a radical abandonment of
6 ratemaking principals” by its financing proposal, it is the District that is asking the Commission
7 to consider an extraordinary ratemaking procedure. Comments of the District at 1. It is
8 standard ratemaking practice for a utility to build the necessary infrastructure to meet its service
9 obligations. After the infrastructure is completed, the utility seeks cost recovery in a rate case
10 proceeding - the costs are known as well as whether the plant is used and useful. The
11 Commission, in its analysis, also considers the prudence of the costs incurred. In this manner,
12 the Commission is able to analyze the necessity and appropriateness of the costs.

13 Instead, the District is asking the Commission to compare its estimated costs to build
14 the plant to the Company's estimated costs to build the plant. There is no guarantee that the
15 estimates will be the same as the actual costs nor that all the costs will result in plant that is
16 ultimately determined to be used and useful. In essence, the District is asking the Commission
17 to put the cart before the horse and determine prudence based on estimated costs. In other
18 words, the District is asking the Commission to determine whether or not the Company can
19 build the necessary plant to meet its service obligations based on speculation as to what those
20 costs may be. Such a procedure is implausible, offends the notion of what is fair and
21 reasonable, and should be rejected by the Commission.

22 Moreover, the District's request, if approved, is likely to result in the abrogation by the
23 Commission of its ratemaking authority. The Company has testified that if its hook-up proposal
24 is rejected by the Commission, it will not build the White Tank Plant – at least for the time

1 being. Transcript at 317. With no other water source that the District is aware of in the White
2 Tank area, the Company will have no choice but to purchase its capacity from the District's
3 new treatment plant. Id. at 490. According to the District, this will most likely occur in long
4 term capacity contracts bargained for between the Company and the District. Transcript at
5 598. Clearly, the District being the only source of treatment capacity will be in a far better
6 bargaining position than the Company. Coupled with the fact that the District and the
7 Company have a long history of unsuccessful negotiations, it is not difficult to imagine a
8 scenario where the ratepayers' interests are overlooked.

9 The most likely scenario would involve the rates the District charges the Company. The
10 District is an unregulated entity and therefore not subject to the Commission's oversight.
11 When asked whether the District would agree to submit its capacity contracts to the
12 Commission for final approval, the District answered in the negative. Transcript at 598. The
13 District also testified that that it is not willing to submit to the rate and other jurisdiction of the
14 Commission. Transcript at 554. Hence, it would be the District, and not the Commission
15 setting rates which is likely to be contrary to the best interests of the rate payers³. The
16 Commission should not abrogate its ratemaking authority to the District.

17 There are other reasons why the Commission should reject the District's attempt to
18 block the Company from building the plant. For example, if the District were successful in this
19 matter, and then built the plant and later decided to sell the plant, the District, not the
20 Commission would decide how any profit would be distributed. Again, it is unlikely that
21 ratepayers would benefit from this situation. Whereas, if the Company built the plant and
22

23 ³ For example, there are some ratepayers that are not landowners – this would include residents of
24 Verrado. Transcript at 488. The District admits it would not have the same level of commitment to the
Company's Verrado customers as it would have to the District's landowners. Transcript at 491-492.

1 subsequently sold it, the Commission would ultimately decide if ratepayers were entitled to a
2 portion of any gain on the sale.

3 Perhaps more disconcerting is the message that the Commission would send if the
4 District's proposal was approved. The message would be clear that the Commission is willing
5 to disregard standard ratemaking practice and second guess beforehand a utility's decision to
6 build infrastructure necessary to perform its obligation to service its customers. The
7 consequences of such a message could have a chilling affect on how utilities conduct their
8 business in the future.

9
10 **THE COMMISSION SHOULD APPROVE THE COMPANYS HOOK-UP FEE REQUEST TO**
11 **FINANCE CONSTRUCTION OF THE WHITE TANKS PLANT**

12 There is no dispute that the Company is not in the position to finance the construction at
13 this time and seek recovery of its investment after the facility is completed. The Company's
14 request, to finance the construction with increased hook-up fees is reasonable.

15 The facts, which are not in dispute, are that the Company needs to serve its customers
16 and construction of a treatment plant is necessary to meet the Company's service
17 requirements. The Company is unable to finance the new plant at this time and financing the
18 plant through increased hook-up fees is a cost-free source of financing. Rigsby rebuttal at 4.
19 Moreover, the hook-up fees will be booked as Contributions In Aid Of Construction ("CIAC")
20 which has the effect of decreasing ratebase and lowering rates. Id. at 5. The Company's
21 proposal is reasonable and should be adopted by the Commission.

22 The Company has proposed two hook-up fee alternatives both of which would increase
23 hook-up fees to finance construction of the plant. RUCO recommends that the Commission
24 adopt the alternative (Option 2) which provides for the greater increase in the hook-up fees.

1 The greater the increase in hook-up fees, the lower the amount of AFUDC accruals, which
2 translates to today's rates being lower than otherwise would be the case.

3
4 **CONCLUSION**

5 The Commission should approve the Company's increased Hook-Up Fee proposal to
6 finance the cost of the White Tank Treatment plant. RUCO recommends the Commission
7 approve the Company's second option of a hook-up fee that would start at \$4,700 for a 5/8 by
8 3/4-inch meter. RUCO does not object to the Company's request for an accounting order.
9 However, RUCO requests that the Commission indicate in its Decision on this application that
10 it is not predetermining the appropriateness of any such modifications to the Hook-Up Fee or
11 the appropriateness of any mechanism to recover operation and maintenance costs.

12
13 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 17th day of April 2007

14
15
16
17 _____
Daniel Pozefsky
Staff Attorney

18
19 AN ORIGINAL AND THIRTEEN COPIES
20 of the foregoing filed this 17th day
of April 2007 with:

21 Docket Control
22 Arizona Corporation Commission
23 1200 West Washington
24 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

COPIES of the foregoing hand delivered/
mailed this 17th day of April 2007 to:

Teena Wolfe
Administrative Law Judge
Hearing Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

David W. Prescott
Trend Homes, Inc.
890 W. Elliot Road
Gilbert, AZ 85233

Greenberg Traurig
2735 E. Camelback Road, Suite 700
Phoenix, AZ 85016

Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel
Legal Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Franklyn D. Jeans
Beus Gilbert
4800 N. Scottsdale Rd.
Suite 6000
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

Ernest Johnson, Director
Utilities Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Derek L. Sorenson
Quarles Brady Streich Lang
Two N. Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Craig A. Marks
Craig A. Marks PLC
3420 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 200
Phoenix, Arizona 85028

By _____
Ernestine Gamble

Sheryl A. Sweeney
Michele L. Van Quathem
Ryley Carlock & Applewhite, P.A.
One North Central Ave., Suite 1200
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Jeffrey W. Crockett
Bradley S. Carroll
Snell & Wilmer
400 E. Van Buren
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Michael W. Patten
Timothy J. Sabo
Roshka, DeWulf & Patten
One Arizona Center
400 E. Van Buren
Phoenix, AZ 85004